DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 239 CS 505 687

AUTHOR Bode, Robert A.
TITLE An Intercultural Paradigm of Nonviolence.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (73rd, Boston, MA, November 5-8, 1987).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conflict Resolution; Disarmament; Ethnocentrism; Foreign Countries; *Foreign Policy; Global Approach; *International Cooperation; National Security; *Nuclear Warfare; *Peace; Persuasive Discourse; *Rhetoric; World Affairs; World Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Nonviolence; Nuclear Deterrence; Reagan (Ronald); Reagan Administration; United States; USSR

ABSTRACT

Much of the rhetoric used by world leaders is one of violence, based on destructive myths and images, which increases the probability of war. Such leaders attempt to persuade the public that militarism, threats, and sociopolitical superiority are effective strategies for peace, when in fact they maximize cultural and political differences. The United States presently supports increased militarism to ensure a dominant political position in world politics, and hence it has increased armaments and proposed the militarization of space and the possibility of winning a limited nuclear war. Additionally, popular news magazines have characterized the Soviets as "savages, dupes, despots, and barbarians," prompting the United States to believe itself superior and adopt a "bullying" posture. History suggests that belief in such a "myth of superiority" can provoke violence in the most civilized nations. A solution to perpetuation of these "myths of violence" is a paradigm of nonviolence, which encourages communicators to abstain from the use of hostile speech and acts. Tenets of the paradigm include: (1) adopting a spatial view of the world, which sees humans as world citizens; (2) a willingness to abstain from physical or psychological violence; (3) social and political responsibility; (4) shared values; (5) creating new ethics; (6) long-term, future, macro-orientation; and (7) interaction among the paradigm's tenets. Such a paradigm, if it is adhered to, can create a more cooperative climate in which cultural and political interaction can occur. (JC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED285239

AN INTERCULTURAL PARADIGM OF NONVIOLENCE

by

Robert A. Bode

Graduate Student
Department of Rhetoric & Communication
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403
Message (503) 686-4171
Home (503) 484-5240

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A. Bode

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS505687

Abstract

International communicators, who have relied upon rhetorical violence in the form of militaristic maneuvers, threats, and arguments of sociopolitical superiority have relied upon mythic beliefs. This paper argues that such influence attempts are outdated, ineffective, and in need of repair. A nonviolent paradigm, which encourages communicators to abstain from the use of hostile speech and acts, is offered. The paradigm includes seven tenets which, if adhered to, may bring about new forms of international interaction.

Introduction

We are killing one another in a world which seems to be lacking in compassion. We set the scene for violence with rhetoric which justifies acts of terror, savagery, and murder. We commit unjust discriminations upon the basis of race, national origin, and political ideology. Too much of our rhetoric maximizes differences which can lead to human slaughtering in the form of armed conflict.

When we listen to much of the rhetoric of world leaders we hear a rhetoric of violence. Militarism is at center stage and threats to use military killing machines can be heard daily. There are cries for peace by voices of violence. A great deal of the public rhetoric is aimed at an audience which has been persuaded to accept the myths that militarism, threats, and sociopolitical superiority are effective strategies for peace. Leaders who advocate policy by a reliance upon this sort of rhetoric are taking us to the edge of disaster. The probability of war is increased by a rhetoric of violence. I propose that we adopt a new form of global interaction.

Some of our actions and interactions in the world community are based upon myths and images. Too many private and public citizens are living with myths and images that are destructive. Many assert that we are sophisticated thinkers, that we are humane, and that we are civilized. However, even the most advanced societies have members who are regular participants in

outrageous acts of violence. How we think about and behave toward people in the international community deserves serious consideration. Some myths and images which govern thinking and behaving deserve to be challenged. In particular, the myth that reliance upon militarism is an effective and peaceful strategy will be challenged. I will challenge the myth that governance by threat is an effective strategy. Further, I will argue that the myth of superiority leads to savagery which highly civilized persons willingly commit.

One major goal of this paper is to examine myths and images, and an attempt will be made to demonstrate that some myths and images are harmful to peaceful international relations. A brief discussion of how myths and images are shaped will be offered. The other major goal of this paper is to offer a paradigm which aims at restructuring how we interact with each other internationally. The later portion of the paper is dedicated to the proposition that we can become more effective and peaceful international communicators.

Myths and Images

Myths "are general statements about the world and its parts, and in particular about nations and other human in-groups, that are believed to be true."[1] Myths are "based on faith more than fact."[2] Academics, asserts McNeill, ought to have a responsibility to deal with myths so as to "trigger a successful reorganization of public myths."[3] Northrop Frye suggests that myths can be analyzed to see what "typical, recurring images" appear in myths.[4] It seems that myths and images are created by our language.

According to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, "our very thought processes and the way we see the world are shaped" by our language.[5] Our rhetoric, then, shapes our vision of the world, our realities, and our myths and images. Some myths that we hold are harmful.

One popular myth that has a significant and harmful impact upon international relationships is the myth that militarism is an effective tool for peace. An examination of the United States as a hegemonic world power illustrates a reliance upon militarism. A contemporary popular and political belief is that the U.S. can maintain a dominant political position in world politics through armament. Many people even argue that armament is the path to peace. This belief, Senghaas points out, could, however, "become a special danger for world peace."[6] Over the past three decades, the world-wide

distribution of power, in part due to an economic downswing, has been redistributed and the U.S. has lost some of its economic influence.[7] The U.S. has attempted to compensate for the loss of economic power by increasing armaments. Historically, the probability of war has actually been shown to increase under these conditions.[8]

Threats of military intervention, talk about winning limited nuclear war, and the militarization of space can be considered earmarks of a belief that military power is considered a viable option for peacemaking. Many people in the U.S. and many U.S. policy makers believe in what has been called the myth of the last move. "This is the belief that after some new military deployment, the game will stop and some alleged disparity will be rectified. . . The game does not stop: new moves produce countermoves,"[9] and the myth continues to perpetuate itself. Some scholars suggest this belief only increases the likelihood of war.[10] We are living in a time in which peace is threatened, and a new form of international exchange, which does not rely upon military superiority, appears worthwhile.

Another myth that seems to exist, is President Reagan's belief about the Russians. His image of the Soviet Union and her people is that they cannot be trusted, that "they do not keep their word," and that they have a willingness "to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat" in order to attain world communism.[11] Reagan "views international politics in the modern era

as a struggle between democracy and totalitarianism, between right and wrong, good and evil."[12] How to deal with the Soviet Union has been the subject of much debate and Yergin has called the U.S. posture the "Riga axiom."[13] This perspective is one which views the Soviet Union as "a world revolutionary state, denying the possibilities of coexistence, committed to unrelenting ideological warfare, powered by a messianic drive for world mastery."[14] Reagan seems to believe in this image of the Soviet Union, and he has chosen to use a bullying strategy in order to deal with Russia.[15] By citing historical records where the bullying startegy has been used to deal with Russia, Leng concludes that influence attempts, which carry military and other threats have been largely ignored and defied.[16] Specific threats alone, according to Leng, have been defied 80 percent of the time.[17] In the face of evidence, which contradicts Reagan's belief about how to deal with the Soviet Union, he appears to continue to believe that the bullying strategy is an effective one. As such, President Reagan seems to believe and tries to publicly persuade us to accept the myth that threats toward the Soviet Union are workable means for solving international problems.

President Reagan is not alone. Perhaps he, like many other Americans, has been victimized by generative myths that have been shaped by the rhetoric of popular news magazines. Covering a thirty-year period, Time, Newsweek, and U.S. News and World Report have characterized Russians as "savages, dupes,

despots, and barbarians and their methods and behavior as brutal, treacherous, conniving, unmanly, aggressive, and animalistic."[18] After his analysis of rhetoric and symbols contained in these leading news magazines, Corcoran asserts that a "systematic omission of balanced and potentially conflicting information about the Russian character" has helped bring about "three dominating, generative myths: (1) the Russians are a remote, faceless people living in a remote, inhumane landscape; (2) Soviet leaders are obsessively power-hungry, driven by an irrational appetite for conquest; (3) Soviet leaders are uncivilized, blasphemous savages."[19] These images are "generative in the sense that they are consistent sources of recurring images in the surface-structure of news reportage."[20] Many U.S. citizens, as well as some of her leaders, may be victims of a false image of Soviet citizens and leaders. The implications of these mythic images of the Soviet Union and her people are serious. The myth can guide our policies, shape our behaviors, and impact our interaction. Ultimately, belief in these myths could even lead to another myth. The newly shaped myth can be called the myth of superiority.

The myth of superiority can lead to savagery. Dr. William Eckhardt, a noted peace scholar, argues that "atrocious, genocidal, and holocaustal behaviors" are manifestations found in highly civilized societies.[21] His position is particularly important to consider because of the high level of civilization

which many espouse that we experience in the United States. Anthropological evidence suggests that "more developed and settled agricultural tribes engaged in more acts of killing, mutilating, and torturing [of their enemies] than did the more primitive nomadic tribes."[22] The same evidence indicates that "war . . . [was most prevalent] . . . among civilized city-dwellers."[23] Historical evidence offers the conclusion that "the more civilized . . . the more atrocious our behavior became."[24] Western civilization has been even more atrocious than its predecessors.[25]

> The civilization that we know today began about 1500 AD in Europe with the aid of the printing press, the gun, the Inquisition, the Renaissance, the Reformation, Christian persecution of the Jews, confiscation of Jewish property, and expulsion of the Jews from England, France, Spain, and Portugal. Modern civilization was characterized by the expansion of Western Civilization to the rest of the world by means of military conquest, Christian missions, and capitalist trade, including the Atlantic slave trade which involved the death and enslavement of millions of Africans from the 16th to the 19th centuries. Millions of native Americans (both North and South) were also offered as sacrifices to Western expansion. Modern slavery and wars were more deadly than slavery and wars in previous civilizations. If there was a touch of Fascism at the beginning of modern civilization, there was a blaze of it toward the end, and quite a bit of it throughout. In this respect, modern civilization differed from other civilizations only in degree, since all civilizations were Fascist in the sense of benefiting some chosen people at the expense of others. All civilizations were based on exploitation, but modern civilization (simply because it was a latecomer) exploited and exterminated more people more efficiently than any previous civilization.[26]

In relatively recent history, four national and international leaders, when asked, expressed the values of "patriotism (including racial purity), aggression, dominance (authoritarianism at home and imperialism abroad), determinism (courage), achievement (superiority), denunciation of aggression in others, and religion."[27] These were the values expressed by Fascist leaders Mussolini, Hitler, Goebbels, and Rockwell.[28] Eckhardt carefully reminds us that "you don't have to 'be' superior in order to be a Fascist, you simply have to 'believe' in the myth of superiority."[29] It should be noted that the "myth of superiority . . . [accounts] for the atrocities, genocides, and holocausts perpetrated by civilizations throughout their histories."[30]

When the question "Who is responsible?" for atrocities, genocides, and holocausts is asked, the answer is a stunning one. They "are committed by generally good people (good Germans at Auschwitz, good Americans at My Lai, etc.), who believe in their superiority and the superiority of their cause . . . [they are] unconditionally obedient . . . doing their duty . . . conforming to rules and regulations . . . conformist in their moral judgments . . . believe laws of the land must be right . . . [and will behave extremely violently] under conditions of orders from legitimate authority."[31] Militarism, beliefs in use of threats and bullying strategies, and superiority are myths which, some argue, could lead to a final holocaust. Eckhardt makes the point by writing, "If you've seen one

nuclear holocaust, you've seen them all."[32] The potential harm of the myths of militarism, threat, and superiority do not deserve to be overlooked. They deserve to be questioned, evaluated and re-evaluated, and replaced.

Repairing Myths: A Nonviolent Paradigm

The myths of militarism, threats and bullying, and superiority share common threads. Most obviously these myths are violent in nature. Each carries an explicit or implicit statement of violence, either physical or psychological. Each myth is wrapped in rigidity. Part of the message inherent in these myths calls for the suffering of other persons. Each myth could also be considered inhuman and inhumane. Each could be destructive. These myths carry with them degrees of tension that range from intrapersonal to intercultural. The present structure of these belief systems deserves to be changed, removed, or replaced. The paradigm which follows is an attempt to create an option to the rhetoric of violence. The design of the paradigm is intended to serve as an orientation which creates a new frame of reference for an effective sociopolitical technique for interaction.

A Nonviolent Paradigm

1. Spatial View. The assumption which undergirds the spatial view is that we are culturally myopic and dangerously self-centered. We have drawn artificial borders, have displayed ferocious behaviors when trying to take or protect borders, and have unleased our willingness to kill for higher ground. In addition to physical boundaries we have drawn ideological, political, and religious boundaries. Each of

these boundaries can add to militaristic actions. Images which take into account a spatial view soften borders and create the vision that humankind is on this planet together. A major step in the direction of realizing our togetherness could come from a delegitimization of the global war system.[33]

The world military complex appears unable to comprehend technological reality. Some military minds seem to be locked into history. Gone are the days when disputes could, at worst, escalate into a conventional world war. Today, the threats of military power are much greater. Radiation, wind currents, or nuclear winter are not hampered by artificial borders. In essence, to use nuclear weapons is to use them on ourselves. A spatial view admits to the connections of all humankind and rejects separateness with regard to narrowly defined differences.

2. Strong Nonviolence. The strong nonviolent posture accepts a willingness to abstain from imposing physical and psychological violence upon others, and attempts to eliminate hostile thoughts, words, and acts.[34] One who adopts a strong nonviolent posture realizes the hostility generated by specific and nonspecific threats, chooses to interact in other ways, and attempts to create new interactional patterns. An earmark of strong nonviolence is a willingness to temporarily abdigate power. Another earmark of this position is the rejection of absolutes and the realization that solutions to problems lie between conflicting parties. The goal is to synthesize opposing claims.[35]

3. Social and Political Responsibility. Communicators are asked to realize the implications of their behaviors. There are moral and ethical standards that override narrow ideological or political goals which are often regionally bound. Extravagant pretentions that are articulated by leaders of prominence, deserve to be called into public question. The hollow belief that one knows what the public wants, is a claim that is worthy of examination. Responsibility to a political party, state, region, or country is inadequate. We have reached a period in which we should realize that we are common inhabitants of the earth.

4. Shared Values. Kenneth Boulding has described science as testable fantasy.[36] Tests, argue Boulding, should be applied to fiction and myth.[37] In essence, tests should go beyond personal experiences. Examples of positions worth testing are leaders' views of other ideological, political, or religious systems. The speaker who asserts infinite understanding of other peoples of the globe can be considered a terrorist. Social scientific methods, implies Boulding, can be used to unearth shared values. These types of inquiries can move us from a focus upon differences to a focus upon similarities. Social scientists, after discovering shared values, can teach present and future leaders the shared values between cultures.

5. Creating New Ethics. The Doctrine of the Just War held by some Christian ethicists is "susceptible to

misapplication and corruption," and no longer deserves to be used as a war legitimizing argument.[38] "Two of the most important requirements of 'justice,' according to the doctrine, [are]: (1) the principle of proportionality between the destruction of war and the evil it is supposed to avert, and (2) the principle of leaving non-combatants unscathed."[39] In an age when nuclear arsenals have the potential to destroy planetary life several times over, the just war doctine is obsolete. At a Christian conference, which was "the most representative gathering of church leaders since the break between Constantinople and Rome in 1054,"[40] a document was written which stated that "the production and threat to use nuclear weapons capable of annihilating the human race demonstrates an ultimate arrogance before God who alone disposes of life and death."[41] In the event leaders will not listen to peace advocates, public opinion, or social scientists and scholars, perhaps they will listen to St. Augustine's inner teacher[42] as a voice calls upon them to abstain from murder in the guise of military arsenal use.

6. Long-Term, Future, Macro-Orientation. Strategic thinking, at times, appears to be focused on the moment, the past, and the micro level. An example of this kind of thinking can be a military attempt to recapture an embassy building in a particular country. Behaviors of this sort do not seem to take into account the well being of others, conflicting ideologies, or international relationships considered over

time. Immediate reactions to recent events which concern a particular group, should, at face value, be considered suspect.

7. Interaction Among The Paradigm's Tenets. Each of the paradigm's tenets has a unique contribution insofar as shaping a new way of looking at people in the world community. There is also room for the tenets to interact with one another. Consider tenets 1 and 2 (spatial view and strong nonviolence). Adherents to this simple combination would be willing to consider the idea that we are inhabitants of the same planet who happen to have different beliefs which need not be resolved militarily. Practitioners of tenets 1 and 2 will realize that not only are there differences on earth, which need not be resolved militarily, but that absolutism does not bring about a synthesis of opposing claims. Reflections upon how to bring about interaction among the tenets allows for many combinations and ways of shaping both thought and behavior which can be directed toward others.

Implications

The nonviolent paradigm, because it can create a new frame of reference, can create a more cooperative climate in which interaction can occur. When one abstains from the use of hostile thoughts, words, and acts an opponent may respond in kind. This has been called mirror-imaging.

The nonviolent paradigm could also have humanizing effects. Rhetorical strategies which create the image that Soviet leaders are uncivilized, blasphemous savages are rejected by leaders who practice the paradigmatic tenets. The paradigm humanizes because it calls for a consideration of other realities. For example, by accepting the tenet of shared values a leader may realize that Soviet leaders seek to live without threats of destruction, that they value their families, and that they love their children. Such a realization of shared values would surely seem to humanize.

Finally, practitioners of the paradigmatic tenets, by refraining from a rhetoric of violence, have significant choices. The shallow voices which cry out the need for military power, use threats, and publicly scream of their ethical, moral, and ideological superiority carry a dulling and familiar ring. At the very least these voices are reflections of insignificant and unoriginal thinkers. At worst, these voices add to the cycle of rhetorical violence which increase the likelihood of physical violence. Even the medieval village idiot knew that

violence begets violence. The strong nonviolence and new ethics tenets most directly address the possibility for a public rhetorician to engage in significant choice making through their rhetorical strategies.

Conclusion

Militarism, threat, and superiority myths have been discussed and called into question as acceptable ways of interacting internationally. Political and social scientists, peace scholars, and sophisticated thinkers of various persuasions call upon us to examine some of our belief systems. Some myths, the argument has been, demand rigorous thought and reshaping. An attempt has been made to offer new hope.

A way of looking at inhabitants of the earth has been recommended by paradigmatic tenets which focus upon absence of physical and psychological violence. The goal has been to generate a perspective which creates options. This paper represents an attempt to reshape some of the ways in which we view peoples and cultures. Finally, the aim of this paper has been to offer a sociopolitical technique for interaction which can help draw people of the globe nearer to one another in the conquest for peace.

Endnotes

[1]William H. McNeill, "The Case and Repair of Public Myth," Foreign Affairs (Fall 1982), p. 1.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. 7.

[4]Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), pp. 95-9.

[5]Steven W. Littlejohn, Theories of Human Communication (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1978), p. 132.

[6]Dieter Senghaas, "The Cycles of War and Peace," Bulletin of Peace Proposals 14 (1983), p. 119.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, World Armaments and Disarmament: SIPRI Yearbook 1984 (London: Taylor and Francis, 1984), p. 1.

[10]Senghass, pp. 119-24.

[11]Russell J. Leng, "Reagan and the Russians: Crisis Bargaining Beliefs and the Historical Record," The American Political Science Review 78 (June 1984), p. 339.

[12]Ibid.

[13]D. Yergin, Shattered Peace (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977), p. 11.

[14]Ibid., pp. 41-68.

[15]Leng, pp. 339-40.

[16]Ibid., pp. 342-45.

[17]Ibid., p. 344.

[18]Farrel Corcoran, "The Bear in the Back Yard: Myth, Idedogy, and Victimage Ritual in Soviet Funerals," Communication Monographs 50 (December 1983), pp. 305-20.

[19]Ibid., pp. 307-8.

[20]Ibid.

[21]William Eckhardt, "Atrocities, Civilizations, and Savages: Ways to Avoid a Nuclear Holocaust," Bulletin of Peace Proposals 13 (1982), p. 343.

[22]Ibid., p. 344.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Ibid.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., pp. 346-7.

[32]Ibid., p. 343.

[33]Anatol Rapoport, "Prospects of Demilitarization: Strategic 'Wisdom' and Collective Rationality," Bulletin of Peace Proposals (14) (1983), p. 385.

[34]Raghavan Iyer, The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi, 2d ed. (London: Concord Grove Press, 1983), p. 178.

[35]Joan V. Bondurant, Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), pp. 189-233.

[36]Kenneth Boulding, "Reflections on Values, Science, War and Peace: What Signs of Hope?" Bulletin of Peace Proposals 14 (1983), p. 351.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Kjell Skjelsbaek, "Rethinking Christian Ethics of Peace and War in the Nuclear Age," Bulletin of Peace Proposals 14 (1983), p. 263.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Ibid., p. 264.

[41]Ibid., p. 265.

[42]Joseph Anthony Mazzeo, "St. Augustine's Rhetoric of Silence," Journal of the History of Ideas 23 (April-June 1962), pp. 191-2.

Bibliography

Bondurant, Joan V. Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Boulding, Kenneth. "Reflections on Values, Science, War and Peace: What Signs of Hope?" Bulletin of Peace Proposals 14 (1983): 351-4.

Corcoran, Farrel. "The Bear in the Back Yard: Myth, Idedogy, and Victimage Ritual in Soviet Funerals." Communication Monographs 50 (December 1983): 305-20.

Eckhardt, William. "Atrocities, Civilizations, and Savages: Ways to Avoid a Nuclear Holocaust." Bulletin of Peace Proposals 13 (1983): 343-9.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Iyer, Raghavan. The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi, 2nd ed. London: Concord Grove Press, 1983.

Leng, Russel J. "Reagan and the Russians: Crisis Bargaining Beliefs and the Historical Record." The American Political Science Review 78 (June 1984): 338-55.

Littlejohn, Steven W. Theories of Human Communication. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1978.

Mazzeo, Joseph Anthony. "St. Augustine's Rhetoric of Science." Journal of the History of Ideas 23 (April - June 1962): 175-96.

McNeill, William H. "The Case and Repair of Public Myths." Foreign Affairs (Fall 1982): 1-13.

Nakhre, Amrut. "Meanings of Nonviolence: A Study of Satyagrahi Attitudes." Journal of Peace Research 13 (1976): 185-96.

Raporport, Anatol. "Prospects of Demilitarization: Strategic 'Wisdom' and Collective Rationality." Bulletin of Peace Proposals 14 (1983): 381-6.

Senghaas, Dieter. "The Cycles of War and Peace." Bulletin of Peace Proposals 14 (1983): 119-24.

Skjelsbaek, Kjell. "Rethinking Christian Ethics of Peace and and War in the Nuclear Age." Bulletin of Peace Proposals 14 (1983): 263-8.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. World Armaments and Disarmament: SIPRI Yearbook 1984. London: Taylor and Francis, 1984.

Yergin, D. Shattered Peace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.